



San Diego Association of Car Clubs

August 19, 2014,
Brandon Baranco
Office of Assemblymember Nancy Skinner
Elihu Harris State Building
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2201
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 286-1400 / Fax: 1406

Dear Mr. Baranco

RE: AB 69 Perea and AB 32 Pavley

I would like to take a minute to thank Honorable Assembly member Nancy Skinner for her help and concerns about 2006 Assembly Bill (AB) 32 Pavley, this important matter that will effect so many of us.

A question came to me, would a voluntary use of GMO Ethanol in our fuel and a quality audit of the Smog Check program further improve the performance of AB 32 law?

Thanks for your service.

Respectfully
James Stukey
CA Automotive green job professional

cc: interested parties

<http://carclubcouncilofsandiego.com/>

August 18, 2014

Dear Mr. Stukey,

Thank you for contacting Assemblymember Nancy Skinner about your suggestion to delay the implementation of Assembly Bill 32.

Assemblymember Skinner appreciates you taking the time to express your views.

AB 32 created a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit that would reduce emission 25% by 2020. The bill would authorize the Air Resource Board to achieve these reductions through a cap-and-trade program.

As the bill is no longer before the legislature, I encourage you to contact the California Air Resources Board at P.O. Box 2815 Sacramento, CA 95812 or online at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/contact.htm>.

Please be assured that I will inform Assemblymember Skinner of your communication. If you would like to track the process on this bill, you may go to: <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/>.

If you have questions about this or another state matter, feel free to contact the office at (510) 286-1400 or via email at www.asmdc.org/members/a15/.

Sincerely,

Brandon Baranco

Office of Assemblymember Nancy Skinner, AD 15

Did you like this article? Share it with your friends!

A casualty of the state's emissions war

By Dan Walters, Sacramento Bee, January 3, 2015

Truth, it's been said, is the first casualty of any war.

Logic appears to be the first casualty of California's somewhat lonely war on climate-changing emissions of carbon dioxide, as two current skirmishes indicate.

Let's start with the Air Resources Board's decree that automotive fuel, considered to be the state's major source of carbon, be brought into its "cap-and-trade" system of limits this year.

Refiners must account for carbon emissions as California motorists drive more than 300 billion miles each year and consume about 15 billion gallons of fuel.

Fuel suppliers must pay for emission tonnage "allowances" from a pool created by the state, either directly or from other owners, and presumably will pass on their cost to motorists.

The effect at the gas pump is still unclear, with estimates, officially and otherwise, running from a few cents a gallon to as many as 76 cents.

Program supporters are downplaying potential impacts, arguing that with gas prices otherwise in steep decline, motorists will scarcely feel the nibble on their wallets.

But doesn't that miss the point, which is to reduce carbon emissions by compelling motorists, through higher gas prices, to cut down on fuel purchases and use?

If the effect is, in fact, as minuscule as it's being portrayed — Assembly Speaker Toni

Atkins, for instance, says it's "a few pennies, maybe" — and motorists don't notice it, then they won't reduce driving.

Logically, one would think, cap-and-trade advocates should want the nibble to be a big bite, at least 50 cents a gallon. Otherwise, it's just an extra tax to generate money for politicians to spend.

And then there's the notion, advanced by Senate President Kevin de León with ardent support of climate change activists, that big state pension funds should be compelled to divest their holdings in coal companies.

"Climate change is the top priority of the California state Senate," de León said during a climate change conference last month. "Coal is a dirty fossil fuel, and we generate very little electricity in California from coal, and I think our values should shift in California."

Coal company executives couldn't care less who owns their stock, unless owners have enough to affect corporate policy. By divesting, California's public pension funds would lose whatever leverage they have on such policy.

Logically, therefore, if de León wants to influence those corporations, he'd compel the pension funds to buy more — a lot more — of their stock. Or he would have California's utilities stop buying any electric power from coal-fired generation plants, which might affect their profits.

However, the latter could affect Californians' utility bills, which might have political repercussions. So it's easier to engage in toothless — and pointless — symbolism.

<http://www.desertsun.com/story/opinion/columnists/2015/01/03/walters-california-carbon-war/21251043/>

Lower ozone and pm might result from a GMO fuel waiver to improve 2015 AB 32 performance.

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

White House Ignored EPA Advice, Will Create Energy

By Frank O'Donnell, Clean Air Trust, June 11, 2001

(Washington, D.C.) - The nonprofit Clean Air Trust today accused the White House of "playing politics" by rejecting a request by California to avoid mandatory use of ethanol in reformulated gasoline in the state.

The Trust noted that the White House ignored the advice of the Environmental Protection Agency, which had concluded that granting California a waiver from the requirement would lead to less smog-forming pollution than if an ethanol mandate were required. (The official EPA recommendation is available from the Clean Air Trust.)

The Trust also noted that the California Energy Commission has predicted that White House decision could lead to gasoline shortages and higher gas prices. The ethanol lobby had stridently opposed California's request. An official announcement is said to be imminent.

"The White House is simply playing politics with this issue," said Frank O'Donnell, executive director of the Clean Air Trust. "This will mean dirtier air and price hikes at the pumps in California," he added.

"This is an astonishingly bad decision -- the California equivalent of arsenic," O'Donnell said, referring to the Bush Administration's earlier decision to rescind arsenic-in-drinking water standards.

"Once again, the views of EPA's professional staff have been thrown in the trash in favor of political considerations," O'Donnell added, noting EPA had concluded that the White House decision would mean up to an additional 26 tons a day of smog-forming pollution in California.

The issue arose because the Clean Air Act

requires that gas sold in the nation's smoggiest cities contain an "oxygenate" that -- in theory -- makes it burn more cleanly. The requirement applies to about 70 percent of the gas sold in California.

Refiners have generally met this oxygen requirement through the additive MTBE. But California ordered MTBE to be phased out by the end of next year because it has contaminated groundwater.

The only practical alternative to MTBE is ethanol, which the California Air Resources Board found (and EPA agreed) creates more smog-forming pollution because it is more volatile. In other words, the oxygen mandate would become an ethanol mandate once MTBE is banned.

California's refiners and the state have concluded that they can make the cleaner-burning gasoline without any mandatory oxygen component.

Mandatory ethanol use poses additional challenges. It generally must be shipped to California from the Midwest. Because of limited ethanol supplies in California, specialists with the California Energy Commission have warned that an ethanol mandate could trigger a 6-10 percent gasoline shortfall by 2003, which would result in gasoline price spikes.

"The only real question here is why did the Bush Administration opt for more dirty air and more energy problems in California," said O'Donnell. "Was this done to cause political damage to California Governor Gray Davis? Was it to punish California's voters? Was it a payoff to ethanol producer Archer Daniels Midland, which contributed heavily to the Bush inauguration -- or was it all of the above?"

<http://www.cleanairtrust.org/release.061101.html>